



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/445,201 | 04/12/2000 | Georg Breier | VOSS1110 | 9638 |

7590 06/20/2003

LISA A. HAILE, Ph.D.
GARY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP
4365 Executive Drive,
Suite 1100
San Diego, CA 92121-2133

EXAMINER

SULLIVAN, DANIEL M

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1636

29

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/445,201

Applicant(s)

BREIER ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel M Sullivan

Art Unit

1636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13, 17-23 and 42-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13, 17-23 and 42-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1636

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is a response to the "Supplemental Amendment..." filed 5 June 2003 (Paper No. 29) in reply to the Final Office Action mailed 23 April 2002 (Paper No. 23). Claims 12, 15, 16, 25-33 and 36-41 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-11, 13, 14, 17-23 and 42-44 were considered in Paper No. 23. Claims 12, 14-16, 25-33 and 36-41 were canceled and claims 1, 3, 9 and 13 were amended in Paper No. 29. Claims 1-11, 13, 17-23 and 42-44 are pending and under consideration.

Response to Amendment

Rejection of claims 1-11, 13, 17-23 and 42-44 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as lacking adequate written description is withdrawn in view of the amendments to the claims in Paper No. 29.

New Grounds

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-11, 13, 17-23 and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled

Art Unit: 1636

in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19USPQ2d 1111, clearly states that “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*.” (See page 1117.) The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed.” (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116).

In the instant case, claims 1 (part (iii)), 3 (part (c)) and 9 (part (c)), and all claims depending therefrom are directed to a DNA comprising a fragment of a nucleotide sequence which comprises a disclosed nucleotide sequence. Because the claims are directed to a fragment of a nucleic acid containing both disclosed and undisclosed sequence, the claimed nucleic acid encompasses a genus of nucleic acids having no structural limitation (i.e., comprising a fragment of the undisclosed sequence). For example, Applicant’s claims encompass any and all fragments of the chromosome comprising SEQ ID NO: 1 which has the function of conferring expression in endothelial cells *in vivo*. In this case, the claimed subject matter is described solely by function with no corresponding structural characteristic. An adequate written description of a DNA requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it; what is required is a description of the DNA itself. It is not sufficient to define DNA solely by its principal biological property, i.e., it confers expression in endothelial cells *in vivo*, because disclosure of no more than that, as in the instant case, is simply a wish to know the identity of any DNA with that biological property. Also, naming a type of material

Art Unit: 1636

generically known to exist, in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, is not a description of that material. Thus, claiming all DNA's that achieve a result without defining what means will do is not in compliance with the description requirement. Rather, it is an attempt to preempt the future before it has arrived. (See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 (CA FC 1993) and *Regents of the Univ. Calif. v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 43 USPQ2d 1398 (CA FC, 1997)).

In view of these considerations, a skilled artisan would not have viewed the teachings of the specification as sufficient to show that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention commensurate to its scope because it does not provide adequate written description for the broad class of *any* and *all* fragments of a nucleotide sequence capable of conferring expression in endothelial cells *in vivo*. Applicant could overcome this rejection by rewriting the claims such that the fragment comprised within the nucleic acid were limited to consisting of a portion of a disclosed nucleic acid sequence.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 7 is indefinite in being directed to a DNA molecule comprising a promoter wherein the promoter is a promoter of hypoxia inducible genes, etc. It is unclear how the claim should be limited in view of the use of the plural. For example, must the promoter be found in more than one gene to be encompassed by the claim? It is recommended that the singular be used

Art Unit: 1636

to describe the promoter to indicate that the promoter is found in at least one gene, if that is what Applicant intends.

Claim 8 is indefinite insofar as it depends from claim 7.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel M Sullivan whose telephone number is 703-305-4448.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Remy Yucel, Ph.D. can be reached on 703-305-1998. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-9105 for regular communications and 703-746-9105 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

dms
June 19, 2003



JAMES KETTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER